

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	Mikko KANERVA	Confirmation No.:	7109
Application No.:	09/893,792	Group Art Unit:	2617
Filed:	June 28, 2001	Examiner:	Daniel Jr., Willie J.

For: TELECOMMUNICATION SYSTEM AND METHOD WITH
LOCATION CRITERIA IN CALL REQUESTS

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement of December 8, 2009, Group I, claims 73-90, are hereby elected, without prejudice to any divisional application that may be filed to cover the non-elected claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding restriction requirement for the following reason.

MPEP §808.01 clearly states: “The particular reasons relied on by the examiner for holding that the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given.” No such showing has been made in this instance. The Examiner merely concludes that since Group I is directed to a method and apparatus receiving a request and determining location information and Group II is directed to a mobile switching center to establish a connection based on location information, they have different modes of operation.